

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/909,975	07/23/2001	Yukio Maki	57454-162	2289	
75	02/01/2005		EXAMINER		
McDERMOTT, WILL & EMERY			OWENS, DOUGLAS W		
600 13th Street, Washington, D	, N.W. C 20005-3096		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
,			2811		
			DATE MAILED: 02/01/2005	DATE MAILED: 02/01/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•			An
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/909,975	MAKI, YUKIO	
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Douglas W. Owens	2811	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 06 January 2005 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applica a timely filed amendment which	ition. A proper reply n places the applica	y to a ition in
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	•		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	date of the final rejection	on.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Officitimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply of the later than three months after the mail	unt of the fee. The approriginally set in the final	opriate extension Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR	•		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	pelow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or sir	nplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceli NOTE:	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claim	S.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	parate, timely filed	amendment
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NO	T place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY to	o issues which were	e newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:		,	
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1 and 3-6</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) applied applied on is a)	roved or b) disapproved by the	ne Examiner.)	

ÉDDIE LEE SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER **TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800**

10. Other: ____

9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments are not convincing. The method taught by Dennison is identical to the method of the claimed invention. Two identical processes would necessarily produce two identical products.

Most importantly, Applicant agrees, in the response filed January 6, 2005, that a region (116) is rounded. Indeed, this region of the surface is entirely rounded. The claims do not require that the entire surface be rounded, only that a surface be entirely rounded. The surface in region 116, is shown in the drawings to be entirely rounded.